REMARKS

This paper is submitted in response to the Office action mailed on September 15, 2006. This paper amends no claims. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-19 are pending.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 10-11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,496,855 to Hunt et al (hereafter "Hunt"). In order for a reference to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the reference must teach each and every element of the claim. For the several reasons recited below, it is respectfully submitted that that Hunt does not anticipate any of the claims.

A. *Independent claims 1, 10 and 19 are not anticipated by Hunt*

1. Hunt fails to disclose that an application server embeds security registration data requirements in the user registration page request.

Claims 1, 10 and 19 are independent claims from which all other pending claims depend. Independent claim 1 states, "by the application server, embedding security registration data requirements in the user registration page request and forwarding the user registration page request to a user registration page of the web application." The Office action (page 3) holds that this limitation is disclosed in col. 7, lines 38-51 and col. 8, lines 15-42 of Hunt. Applicants respectfully disagree that this limitation is disclosed in Hunt. Hunt merely discloses that a new user chooses a user name and password which is required on all subsequent visits to the registration site. *See Hunt*, col. 7, lines 43-45. Hunt fails to disclose that any security registration data requirements have actually been embedded into the user registration page request. Hunt, only discloses that a security field (i.e., password) is included on the registration page.

Hunt further fails to disclose that an application server is responsible for embedding security requirements into the user registration page request. As stated above, Hunt merely discloses that a password field is included on the registration page. However there is no mention of the password being embedded into the user registration page request by an application server. Nor that the user registration page request in forwarded to a user registration page of the web application. Therefore, Hunt fails to disclose this limitation of claim 1.

2. Hunt fails to disclose that the user registration page merges the security data requirements with the user profile registration requirements.

Claim 1 further states that, "by the user registration page of the web application, merging the security registration data requirements from the application server with user

profile registration requirements of the web application to form a user information request page." As stated above, Hunt fails to disclose that an application server is responsible for embedding security requirements into the user registration page request. Therefore, the user registration page of the web application would be unable to merge the security registration requirements from the application server. As such, Hunt fails to disclose this limitation of claim 1.

3. *Hunt fails to disclose that an application server extracts security data from a filled out user information page.*

Claim 1 further states that, "extracting security data from the filled out user information page by the application server." The Office action holds that the mere disclosure of Hunt using an ID and password is sufficient to meet this limitation. The Office action further points to col. 5, lines 12-24, col. 6, lines 44-52 and col. 8, lines 15-42 as support. Applicant respectfully disagree that Hunt discloses this limitation of claim 1. First, the mere disclosure that Hunt use an ID and password is insufficient. Many methods for extracting security data from a user registration page are possible. Hence, without an explicit indication of its method, it cannot be implied from hunt that an application server is responsible for this extraction.

Second, the cited language in Hunt does not disclose this limitation of claim 1. Hunt discloses that a web server stores user profiles in a database. *See* Hunt, col. 5, lines 12-24. Further, Hunt discloses what type of information is stored in a user profile, including ID and password. *See Hunt*, col. 6, lines 44-52. However, the mere inclusion of an ID and password in a user profile is insufficient to infer that an application server extracted security data from a user information page. As stated above, multiple methods for extracting security data from a user information page are possible. It is not sufficient to imply that an application server is responsible for this task. Lastly, Hunt discloses the process for a user to register with a website. *See Hunt,* col. 8, lines 15-42. However, no mention of an application server extracting security data from a user information page is disclosed. Therefore, Hunt fails to disclose this limitation of claim 1. As such, claim 1 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Hunt.

As set forth above, Independent claims 10 and 19 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hunt. Claims 10 and 19 substantially include the same limitations of claim 1, namely, "by the application server, embedding security registration data requirements in the user registration page request and forwarding the user registration page request to a user registration page of the web application" and "extracting security data from the filled out user information page by the application server." For at least the reasons cited above with respect to claim 1, Hunt does not disclose all the limitations of

claims 10 and 19. Thus, claims 10 and 19 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Hunt.

B. Dependent claims 2 and 11 are not anticipated by Hunt

Dependent claims 2 and 11 depend upon and contain all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 10, respectively. Therefore, for at least the reasons mentioned above, Hunt does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 2 and 11. As such, claims 2 and 11 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Hunt.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-5, 7-9, 12-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt and in further view of U.S. Patent No 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. (hereafter "Levergood"). A prima facie case of obviousness requires that a reference or combination of references "teach or suggest all of the claim limitations." See MPEP § 2143. For the several reasons recited below, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Hunt and Levergood do not make any of the above listed claims obvious.

Dependent claims 3-5, 7-9, 12-14 and 16-18 depend upon and include all the limitations of claims 1 and 10, respectively. As stated above, Hunt does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 1 and 10. As Levergood does not disclose, "by the application server, embedding security registration data requirements in the user registration page request and forwarding the user registration page request to a user registration page of the web application", applicants also submit that Levergood does not disclose each and every limitation of claims 1 and 10. Therefore, the combination of Hunt and Levergood also fails to disclose each and every limitation of claims 1 and 10. As such, claims 3-5, 7-9, 12-14 and 16-18 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Hunt and Levergood.

III. Conclusion

This Amendment is submitted contemporaneously with a petition for a two-month extension of time in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.136(a). Accordingly, please charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 in the amount of $450, for two-month extension of time fee. The Applicant believes no further fees or petitions are required. However, if any such petitions or fees are necessary, please consider this a request therefore and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 accordingly.

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his thorough review of the application. The Applicant respectfully submits the present application, as amended, is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowability as soon as practicable.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated: Feb 15 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory P. Durbin, Registration No. 42,503
Attorney for Applicant
USPTO Customer No. 66083

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Republic Plaza Building, Suite 4700
370 Seventeenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202-5647
Phone: (303) 629-3400
Fax: (303) 629-3450